

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**  
**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on August 1, 2003.

Claims 6-12 are pending in the current application.

In the Office Action, claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,307,188 to Dingwall, et al. Claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Related Art in view of Dingwall.

The rejection of independent claim 6 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. None of the cited references teaches, discloses, or suggests all of the features of Applicant's invention as recited in the claims. For example, independent claim 6 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "the lower polarizer includes a light shielding film in a peripheral portion formed in a rectangular shape only along a peripheral portion of the lower polarizer".

Dingwall does not disclose or suggest this feature. Dingwall discloses a black mask 235 that covers the entire surface of the display 234 (Dingwall, column 8, lines 29-31). The mask 235 is clearly not limited to running "only along a peripheral portion" as the claim requires. The Examiner has misinterpreted the claim in alleging that Dingwall discloses a black mask "235 shaped to run along all four sides of only the rectangular lower polarizer" (Office Action of October 10, 2003, page 3, lines 14-16).

The Examiner has misread the claims as requiring the mask to run on "only the rectangular lower polarizer" rather than "only along a peripheral portion" as is clearly recited in the claim. Dingwall clearly does not teach, disclose, or suggest "a light shielding film in a peripheral portion formed in a rectangular shape only along a peripheral portion of the lower polarizer" as recited in claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 and Claims 7-12 which depend from Claim 6 are allowable over the cited references.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 6-12, are allowable over the cited references. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Registration No.: 41,786  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant

**30827**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE